Case 2:15-cr-20652-GCS-DRG ECF No. 1306 filed 02/04/19 PageID.20865 Page 1 of 19

STEVEN SCHARG, ESQ. On behalf of Keithon Porter <u>To Obtain Certified Transcript, Contact:</u> Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, Official Court Reporter Theodore Levin United States Courthouse 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, Room 1067 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 962-1234 Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography. Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

Case 2:15-	cr-20652-GCS-DRG	ECF No. 2	1506	filed (12/04	4/19	PageID.20867	Page 3 of 19
1			I N	D	E	x		
2								Page
3	Jury deliberati	ons						4
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
10								
11								
12								
13								
14								
15		E	v u	פו	-	т	s	
16		E	х н	ь	T	1	5	
17	Identification_						Offered	Received
18								
19		N	0		N		E	
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
	15-2	20652; US	SA v.	EUG	ENE	FIS	SHER, ET AL	

Detroit, Michigan 1 2 Tuesday, August 21, 2019 3 At 8:30 a.m. 4 5 (Jurors resumed deliberations.) 6 7 (Proceedings held without jury at 10:12 a.m.) 8 9 THE COURT: You can take a seat. 10 Again, counsel has been talking with one another 11 about suggested responses to the question. 12 For the record the question reads: We cannot 13 reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm and 14 ammunition charges. 15 So Mr. Daly? MR. DALY: Both sides have agreed to address 16 17 the specific question. It's not a question actually, but 18 a statement as to what their status is. 19 We are asking you to give the jury Court 20 Instruction Number 64, Duty To Deliberate. We have 21 modified just to take out the first sentence, and if I can 22 approach, I will hand it to you, Judge. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. DALY: And we think this would directly 25 address their statement.

THE COURT: Okay. I like the idea. I do feel that we should suggest to them that this is very early in their deliberations given the length of the trial, and the mountain of information presented.

What I had written -- and I'm not led to any particular language -- but this is what I was just jotting down. It would go like this:

This is been a very lengthy trial, and there's been a mountain of information presented. It's not unusual that you would have some difficulty in reaching an unanimous agreement. You have been deliberating for only two and a half days, and it is very early in your deliberations.

You should make a special effort to maintain -this is in response to the shouting and vulgar language
that was observed by other folks through the walls -- You
should make a special effort to maintain a dispassionate
posture in examining and discussing the evidence.

Remember you're fact finders, not advocates. It is very destructive to your role and your relationships to become verbally aggressive or overly aggressive in your deliberation in the case.

MR. DALY: Judge, we are strongly opposed to that for a number of reasons. Their deliberations are suppose to be secretive. We're not even suppose to be

hearing anything, and to comment on what's going on, I think --

THE COURT: Well, nobody heard words that were discernable except for some of the swear words apparently.

MR. DALY: We are invading the secrecy and privacy of deliberations. To comment on it in any way, shape or form, we're simply asking that you give the instruction that we have agreed on without any commentary about how long they have been deliberating, or what they should do, or what their role is. I think that's intrusive as to what's been going on, and it is far beyond what is necessary or what they are really looking for.

So what the parties have agreed to is what we have submitted. Any other commentary we would object.

THE COURT: Mr. Bilkovic?

MR. BILKOVIC: Your Honor, I agree with Mr. Daly in some respects. I agree with him with the rereading the Instruction 64 on deliberations would be present.

I don't necessarily have a problem with the Court telling them that it's been a lengthy trial. So go back and continue. I agree with Mr. Daly that the end portion about the caution about what's going in the jury room might not be appropriate at this point. They might think,

even though the Court has indicated we can't hear words, they might think that somebody is listening to them, and I certainly wouldn't want that to happen.

The other thing that we were suggesting, and I know the defense is oppose to it, is that the Court to let them know to continue to ask questions, and let them know if needed, if there is a transcript that they want to see, that we can make it available to them.

I know there was a question yesterday about

Derrick Kennedy and some other transcripts. The Court

told them not at this time. They might have lost the "not

at this time", and think they cannot get them, and for all

we know, they are arguing about something that Derrick

Kennedy testified to, and somebody says he said this, and

somebody said he said that, and they are not going to

reconcile that because people recall it differently.

I don't think there is anything wrong suggesting to them that if there is specific transcripts that they want, that we could get them available for them.

MR. DALY: Well, what's wrong with it is that they have not asked for it. So the last time they asked for transcripts, you answered it. They have not come back and written a note and say, this is what we want. We want Kennedy transcripts, or we want this. It's pure speculation to now say to them, look it. If you want the

transcripts of Mr. Kennedy when they have not even asked for them, you're invading what the deliberation process of the jury by trying to speculate about what they may or may not want.

It would be fine if you said to them, if you have any other questions, put them in writing, and we'll do our best to answer them. That's fine, but to try to say, you know, well, if you want the Kennedy transcripts, or if you the Scott transcripts, or you want this, just trying to guess at it, that's not appropriate because they have not asked it.

I think our job is to address the questions or the comments, and not to go beyond it.

MR. BILKOVIC: Well, they did ask for it.

They specific asked for Derrick Kennedy's transcript, and the Court at the time said not at this point. I'm not saying tell them now, by the way, if you want Derrick Kennedy's transcript, we can make it available for you.

What I'm saying, when you're instructing them on what you're going to instruct them to, suggest to them that if they need any exhibits, they are available as they've been getting them, and if there are certain transcripts they want, we can make those available for them. I don't think there's anything harmful of that to let them know that if there is something they can't remember, we can help them

with that, especially in the light of the question they asked yesterday. I don't see anything wrong with that.

MR. DALY: Well, what's wrong with it is they are not asking for it. We're not trying to direct the jury towards a certain resolution on our own by trying to guess what they may or may not want, or what may or may not help them to get to a verdict. That's not our job. It's not the Court's job. It's not the government's job, and because they have not asked for anything specific, there's nothing to comment on, Judge. It's that simple.

They know whether that if they want exhibits, they can ask them. They have been doing that. If they a have question, they know they can ask it. Let's not try to figure out what we think may push them in a certain direction when we don't really know. I don't think that's really helpful. I think it is invasive.

MR. BILKOVIC: And while I agree that they know they can ask for exhibits and get them, right now this jury may be thinking, because how that question was answered yesterday, if they need a transcript or want to review a transcript, tough luck. They can't get it. That's my concern, and I think it is an appropriate concern.

MR. DALY: That could be his concern, but that's not way to deal with it. Just because he may have

that particular concern, isn't what the jury is asking for at this point. They are not asking for a transcript.

There is no reason to do this.

So whether it is a legitimate concern or not, doesn't address why we're trying to resolve this.

THE COURT: All right. So you've referred to this question that really isn't a question at all. It is an expression that they cannot reach a decision, except with respect to the firearm and ammunition charges involving Mr. Fisher, and the -- obviously, they want us to know that they are having difficulties, and I think it is reasonable for the Court to invite them if they have some ideas of what would assist them in carrying out their duties, to write a note as you suggested Mr. Daly, and we will attempt to assist them in their deliberations. I see nothing wrong with that.

On behalf of the government, Mr. Bilkovic do you object to that?

MR. BILKOVIC: I do not.

THE COURT: Mr. Daly, you do?

MR. DALY: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, I think we obviously want to reach a conclusion in this case, if it's possible to do so, and I think that the response should not be coercive or -- and so I will give the modified duty to deliberate

as the parties have agreed, but I think I will, as it relates to their expressed difficulties in reaching a decision, I think I will observe that they have been deliberating for only two and a half days, and that if they have ideas about what would assist them to carrying out their duties, they should communicate with the Court by note as instructed earlier.

And for the reasons argued by Mr. Daly, I'll refrain from cautioning them to -- by describing their role as fact finder, and the need -- the desirability of not becoming verbally aggressive or overly defensive in their considerations of the case, although I think that's part of the message they need to get. We can save that for the next expression of difficulty if there is one.

MR. THEIS: Your Honor, just briefly on the issue of the two and a half days, I agree that's an objective fact that's appropriate to tell them.

When you talked about your proposed instruction earlier, you said that it is fairly early in their deliberation. I would stick to just the objective part of it that it is two and a half days because there is no right or wrong or appropriate length, and it sort of implies that you're telling them that there is a certain amount of time. So if we can just leave it to the two and a half days, that would be our preference.

MR. SPIELFOGEL: Your Honor, we should not be 1 2 telling them at all that we consider this early in the 3 deliberations or this is late in your deliberations. THE COURT: I agree with that, and I'm not 4 5 going to tell them that. MR. SPIELFOGEL: For them, this could be like 6 7 they've been back there for a month as far as how they 8 feel. For to us tell them this is early, get back there, 9 that's not our role. 10 THE COURT: Right. Okay. Do you want to 11 receive the partial jury verdict that they said they 12 reached? 13 MR. H. SCHARG: Pardon me? 14 THE COURT: Did you want to entertain the 15 idea of receiving the partial verdict as it relates to --MR. H. SCHARG: We defer that to a later 16 17 time. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. H. SCHARG: I don't think there's the necessity to take that verdict. Obviously at some point 20 21 in time if the -- if a mistrial is declared on the other 22 counts, we can take the verdict at that time. 23 MR. BILKOVIC: The government agrees with 24 that position. 25 THE COURT: Okay.

1	MR. BILKOVIC: Write this down. This is the
2	first time that I've agreed with Mr. Scharg.
3	MR. H. SCHARG: I didn't hear the last part.
4	MR. BILKOVIC: The first time I've agreed
5	with you in three months.
6	MR. H. SCHARG: I thought it was
7	intellectually dishonest.
8	THE COURT: All right. Let's call the jurors
9	in.
10	
11	(Proceedings with jury at 10:29 a.m.)
12	
13	THE COURT: All right, folks. You can take a
14	seat.
14 15	seat. So the Court has received your note. It reads:
15	So the Court has received your note. It reads:
15 16	So the Court has received your note. It reads: We cannot reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm
15 16 17	So the Court has received your note. It reads: We cannot reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm and ammunition charges.
15 16 17 18	So the Court has received your note. It reads: We cannot reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm and ammunition charges. The Court is going to respond as follows:
15 16 17 18 19	So the Court has received your note. It reads: We cannot reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm and ammunition charges. The Court is going to respond as follows: It is your duty to talk to each other about the
15 16 17 18 19 20	So the Court has received your note. It reads: We cannot reach a decision except Eugene Fisher, firearm and ammunition charges. The Court is going to respond as follows: It is your duty to talk to each other about the evidence and to make every reasonable effort that you can

15-20652; USA v. EUGENE FISHER, ET AL

as you listen to what your fellow jurors have to say. Try

your best to work out your differences, but don't hesitate

24

to change your mind if you are convinced that other jurors are right and your original position was wrong. Don't ever change your mind just because other jurors see things differently, or just to get the case over with. In the end your vote must be that, exactly your own vote.

It is important for you to reach unanimous agreement, but only if you can do so honestly and in good conscience. No one will be allow to hear your discussions in the jury room, and no record will be made what you say. You should all feel free to speak your own minds. Listen carefully to what the other jurors have to say, and then decide for yourself if the government has proved a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

So with that, we'll direct you to go back and continue your deliberations.

(Jurors excused and continued deliberating at 10:32 a.m.)

THE COURT: You can take that seat.

So I have Mr. DiBartolomeo working on the transcript of Derrick Kennedy's testimony in case they come back with that request. He is charged with deleting from the transcript sidebar conferences, and any other exchanges that are not within the province of the jury to receive, so that if such a request is made, we can

respond.

2.0

This has been a little bit against my better judgment. It seems to me that the Court should have cautioned them to make a special effort to maintain a dispassionate posture in examining and discussing the evidence, remembering that they are fact finders and not advocates.

So I haven't -- I decided to go with your agreement, but I don't think it is especially helpful to the jury, and I'm sure you could observe the misery on their faces as they came into the courtroom. I think they need a pep talk of some kind, and you might discuss further the appropriate response, something like a response that I suggested.

With that we'll --

MR. BILKOVIC: Your Honor, we may have misunderstood. I thought the Court was going give them a little bit of nudge, and let them know to continue ask questions and things like. Did the Court decide not to do that?

THE COURT: Right.

MR. WECHSLER: We have been talking the whole time. Part of the problem of not addressing transcript issues is that when they ask for specific exhibits the first time, the very first time, we sent back with them a

list of exhibits and said, choose what you want, and then they came back and asked for the transcripts from the trial, more specifically Derrick Kennedy, and we sent them back and said, well, not at this time, but "not at this time" appeared to sort of bury the rest of it, which is your duty to collective memories and whatnot.

Without getting into their minds, the problem is that they likely don't believe they can get transcripts, and so without saying that those are available or anything that you need related to the trial is available or some consideration of that, because we sent them an exhibit list and said, pick out what you want, they may be thinking this is all that we can get, especially in light of the fact they asked for the transcripts of the trial, and we essentially said no.

So that's the concern that we have over here with just leaving it as the instruction as indicated.

MR. DALY: Judge, this is not a fishing expedition where one side or the other tries to figure out what's going on with the jury. That's not our job.

MR. WECHSLER: It was not a fishing expedition.

MR. DALY: That's exactly what they're engaging in now. They are trying to figure out what the jury may or may not want, and that's not our job.

1 MR. WECHSLER: Sorry to interrupt. I agree, 2 but it's not fishing because we had a note where they 3 specifically asked for transcripts from the trial, specifically Derrick Kennedy. That's not out of the blue. 4 This is what they asked for, and as we discussed 5 6 yesterday, we said at this time, and --7 MR. DALY: So what's different now, other 8 than they said that they believe that they are hung, and 9 now you're trying to go back to an issue that we already 10 agreed that the jury will be instructed in a certain way, 11 and that's really the end of the discussion for now, 12 unless they write back and have a specific request for 13 transcripts of a particular witness, and then we can deal 14 with it. 15 MR. WECHSLER: But they did, and we. 16 MR. DALY: That's in the past. 17 MR. WECHSLER: It's in past, but --18 THE COURT: We need to take a short break. 19 20 (Recess taken at 10:38 a.m.) 21 (Proceedings resumed without jury at 11:09 a.m.) 22 23 24 THE COURT: Okay. So listening to counsel's 25 argument, I think, again, I did intend and didn't address

the invitation to have the jurors suggest ways that the Court could assist them to reach an agreement in the case, and I think at this point it is just as well that they not be advised unless there's another note that comes out expressing their inability to reach an outcome. So we'll wait for that next communication if there

is one to come.

(Recess taken at 11:11 a.m.)

(Proceedings adjourned for the day at 2:30 p.m.)

CERTIFICATION

I, Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, official court reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the proceedings in the above-entitled cause on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

s/Ronald A. DiBartolomeo Ronald A. DiBartolomeo, CSR Official Court Reporter

__February 4, 2019 Date